

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 8, 9, and 25 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 19, and 23 are currently being amended. No new matter has been added.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-7, 10-24, and 26-40 are now pending in this application.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-15, 17-19, 22-31, 34-37, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Ogura et al. in View of Ross et al.

In section 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-9, 12-15, 17-19, 22-31, 34-37, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,189,056) in view of Ross et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,628). Claims 8, 9, and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 12-15, 17-19, 22-24, 26-31, 34-37, 39, and 40 are patentable for the reasons that follow.

Ogura et al. discloses an information processing terminal having a form factor defined by the PCMCIA/JEIDA standard. (col. 4, lines 60-62). As stated in the specification: “This invention overcomes a severe restriction in the number and size of components which can be contained within the first housing which must conform to the PCM/JEIDA form factor.” As shown in FIG. 1 of Ogura et al., the information processing terminal may be folded such that the interface housing folds in front of the display when in the folded position. Ogura et al. further discloses, in FIG 7, an example of a prior art device that also folds such that a housing folds in front of the display when in the folded position.

Ross et al. discloses a personal onboard information system comprising a personal digital assistant (PDA) having a card slot configured to receive a PCMCIA or PCMCIA card

(col. 4, lines 56-58). Ross et al. also discloses a cradle configured to receive the PDA and mount the PDA within a vehicle for use by a passenger. (col. 3, lines 17-26).

Independent claim 1 (as amended) recites an electronic module comprising, in combination with other elements, a display, “wherein the display is visible when the interface housing is in the fully-folded position and the interface is coupled to the handheld computer,” which is not disclosed by Ogura et al., alone or in any proper combination with Ross et al. As stated above, Ogura et al. discloses devices where, upon folding, the display is not visible. Ross et al. does not disclose a foldable device. Therefore, Ogura et al., alone or in any proper combination with Ross et al., fails to teach at least one element of claim 1 (as amended). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 1 and corresponding dependent claims 2-7, 12-15, 17, and 18 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent claim 19 (as amended) recites an accessory module comprising, in combination with other elements, a display, “wherein the display is visible when the interface housing is in the fully-folded position and the interface is coupled to the host device.” As discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Ogura et al., alone or in any proper combination with Ross et al., fails to disclose a foldable device wherein the display is visible when the interface housing is in the fully-folded position. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, claim 19 (as amended) is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants therefore request that the rejection of independent claim 19 and corresponding dependent claim 22 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent claim 23 (as amended) recites a portable electronic module comprising, in combination with other elements, an interface housing, “wherein the interface housing is configured to fit a secure digital (SD) slot,” which is not disclosed by Ogura et al., alone or in any proper combination with Ross et al. As stated above, Ogura et al. discloses a device having a “first housing which must conform to the PCMCIA/JEIDA form factor.” Ross et al., discloses a PDA having “at least one slot 206 (shown in FIGS. 2 and 5) for receiving a PCMIA, or PCMCIA, card (not shown).” (col. 4, lines 57-58). To transform the device of

Ogura et al., alone or in any proper combination with the device of Ross et al., into a portable electronic module as recited in claim 23 (as amended) would require further modification, and such modification is taught only by Applicants' own disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 (as amended) is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and request that the rejection of independent claim 23 and corresponding dependent claims 24, 26-31, 34-37, 39, and 40 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants note that in rejecting claim 21, the Examiner stated in part: "Ogura et al. teaches of, wherein the interface housing is configured to fit a secure digital (SD) slot, column 2 lines 65-67." The portion of the specification of Ogura et al. embodying column 2, lines 65-67 recites: "The PDA and PHS parts are each provided with an independent processor unit and memory (RAM and ROM) so that they can operate in parallel to perform a complex processing. The PDA part is provided with a flash memory (1 MB), RAM (128 KB) and Kanji font ROM . . ." Applicants fail to see how Ogura et al. discloses an interface configured to fit a secure digital (SD) slot, and respectfully submit that, in contrast, Ogura et al. teaches away from utilizing an interface housing configured to fit a secure digital (SD) slot by requiring that the interface conform to the PCMCIA/JEIDA form factor, and thus provides additional support for the patentability of independent claim 23 (as amended).

2. Rejection of Claims 10, 11, 16, 20, 32, 33, and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Based Upon Ogura et al. in view of Ross et al., and Further in View of Kotchick et al., Rakib, and Williams

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 10, 11, 16, 20, 32, 33, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al. in view of Ross et al., further in view of Kotchick et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0016327), Rakib (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0044225), and Williams (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063855). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 11, 16, 20, 32, 33, and 38 are patentable for the reasons that follow.

Kotchick et al. discloses user replaceable display modules comprising components configured to customize the appearance of displays for electronic devices. Rakib discloses a remote control for controlling services provided to a customer through headend servers and

other equipment in a bidirectional digital data delivery system implemented over a transmission medium. Williams discloses a digital projection system for phones and PDAs where an image from a PDA or similar device is relayed via circuitry to a video projector for projection.

Claims 10, 11, and 16 depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended and is believed to be patentable over Ogura et al. in view of Ross et al. Kotchick et al., Rakib, and Williams fail to overcome the deficiencies of Ogura et al. and Ross et al. with respect to claim 1. Neither Kotchick et al., nor Rakib, nor Williams discloses a display, “wherein the display is visible when the interface housing is in the fully-folded position and the interface is coupled to the handheld computer,” as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10, 11, and 16, being dependent upon independent claim 1, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and request that the rejection of claims 10, 11, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 19. Claim 19 (as amended) recites a similarly patentable limitation to that of claim 1, discussed above with respect to claims 10, 11, and 16. Claim 19 (as amended) recites a display, “wherein the display is visible when the interface housing is in the fully-folded position and the interface is coupled to the host device.” As with claims 10, 11, and 16, Kotchick et al., Rakib, and Williams fail to make up for the deficiencies of Ogura et al. and Ross et al. with respect to amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 20, being dependent upon independent claim 19, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 38 depend from independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 has been amended and is believed to be patentable over Ogura et al. in view of Ross et al. Kotchick et al., Rakib, and Williams fail to overcome the deficiencies of Ogura et al. and Ross et al. with respect to claim 23. Neither Kotchick et al., nor Rakib, nor Williams discloses a portable electronic module “wherein the interface housing is configured to fit a secure digital (SD) slot,” as recited in independent claim 23 (as amended). Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 32 and 38, being dependent upon independent claim 23, are

patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and request that the rejection of claims 32 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

1/19/2006

By

Chad E. Bement

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5554
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Chad E. Bement
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,991